



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,703	06/18/2001	Craig Carroll	SCP 00.01	1038
27667	7590	09/22/2005		EXAMINER
HAYES, SOLOWAY P.C. 3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140 TUCSON, AZ 85718				NGUYEN, TAI T
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2632	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/883,703	CARROLL, CRAIG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5,8-14,16,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,8-14,16,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. After reviewing the case, the finality of last office action is withdrawn.

Specification

2. The amendment filed October 14, 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the propose amendment filed on October 14, 2004 including a new matter which was not supported in the original specification, e.g. capable of holding information regarding the location of the receiver.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray et al. (US 5,086,290) in view of Davies (US 4,924,211).

Regarding claim 1, Murray et al. disclose an identification system (figures 1-2) comprising:

a plurality of transmitters (10, col. 1, lines 28-53 and col. 2, lines 13 and 37), each transmitter being configured to transmit only a single unique coded signal comprising a unique identification code corresponding only to the transmitter (col. 2, lines 13-16); and

at least one receiver (24, figure 2) being configured to receive only one signal whereby to establish a comparison indication based on comparison on the unique identification code with a unique reference code, wherein the receiver is programmed to respond positively to the unique identification code that matches the receiver with only one of the transmitters (claim 4). Murray et al. disclose everything claimed except for the claimed each of the at least one receiver having a programmable memory for storing the unique reference code and each of receiver including a user interface configured to program the memory. Davies teaches a receiver (14) responding to a plurality of transmitters (10a, 10b), each receiver and transmitter having a unique programmable identification code corresponding to each other respectively, wherein the receiver comprises a programmable memory (98) for storing an unique local identification code related to the receiver (col. 5, lines 9-48) and each receiver includes a user interface (80) configured to program the memory (figure 1; col. 7, line 41 through col. 8, line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the plurality of receivers and user interface as taught by Davies in the system disclosed by Murray et al. for the purpose of enabling the system

to be capable of programming an identification code in the memory to correspond to a particular user's transmitter ID code.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Murray et al. disclose positive indication if the unique code transmitted corresponds to the code received (see abstract).

Regarding claim 3, Murray et al. disclose the system providing no output if the unique code transmitted does not correspond to the code received (see abstract).

Regarding claim 5, Murray et al. disclose the at least one receiver having a controller (34) communicating with an indicator (36, 38, 40) providing an indication based on the comparison of the unique identification code with the unique reference code stored in memory (col. 4, lines 3-28).

Regarding claims 8-9, Murray et al. disclose everything claimed except for the receivers being mounted to a fixed structure/wall. Davies teaches the receivers being mounted within a house (figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the receivers to wall of the house for the purpose of rigidly fixing the monitor location.

Regarding claim 11, refer to claim 1 above, Murray et al., as modified, disclose the instant claimed invention except for the system being used for identifying an infant-mother matches and plurality of receivers. Since Murray et al. disclose the identification system having the same components and functions as the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the system as disclosed by Murray et al., as modified, for identifying infant-mother matching as intended use in order to avoid the confusing between infants

and mothers. The system as disclosed by Murray et al., as modified, fail to disclose a plurality of receivers. The plurality of receivers can be modified for use in identifying a plurality of infant-mother matching in order to facilitate the plurality of uses in the hospital that has more than one infant deliver at the time, the use of plurality of receiver is needed, thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a plurality of receivers for infant-mother matching in the maternity hospital.

Regarding claim 16, refer to claim 5 above.

Regarding claims 19-20, refer to claims 8-9 above.

5. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray et al. (US 5,086,290) in view of Davies (US 4,924,211) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Radomsky et al. (US 6,211,790).

Regarding claim 12, Murray et al., as modified, disclose everything claimed except for the transmitter being coupled to an identification band coupled to an associated infant. Radomsky et al. teach a transmitter (400) being coupled to an identification band (304) coupled to an associated infant (figure 11; col. 10, lines 10-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the transmitter of Murray et al., as modified, could have been used with an infant, as suggested by Radomsky et al. for the purpose of monitoring an infant.

Regarding claim 13, refer to claim 2 above.

Regarding claim 14, refer to claim 3 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed June 29, 2005 with respect to claims 1-3,5,8-14,16,19 and 20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The finality of last office action has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am-5:00pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tai T. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2632

September 19, 2005